



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,250	09/06/2000	Ludovic Pierre	5266-02600	9855
44015	7590	10/25/2010		
OPTV/MEYERTONS MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			EXAMINER SHANG, ANNAN Q	
			ART UNIT 2424	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/25/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent_docketing@intprop.com
ptomhkk@gmail.com
rrankin@intprop.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/657,250

Applicant(s)

PIERRE ET AL.

Examiner

ANNAN Q. SHANG

Art Unit

2424

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/02)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In view of the **Appellant' Brief filed on 04/03/09 and/or BPAI Order Returning Un-docketed Appeal to Examiner filed 01/06/10**, with respect to Claims 1-9, 11-25 and 27-29, **PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED**. The finality of the last office actions (**Final Office action 02/23/07 and/or Examiner's Answer mailed 07/28/09**), been withdrawn and a new ground(s) or rejection is hereby being made as set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Christopher Kelley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12-15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** in view of **Warwick et al (6,598,169)**.

As to claims 1 and 15, **Pohlmann** discloses an event management system and further discloses a system for booking events and initiating actions corresponding to the events, the system comprising:

The claimed limitation "an event broker configured to register a plurality of event bookings in response to requests from one or more clients, where each the event booking identifies an event which may occur in the future and an action to be taken should the identified event occur" is met by Figure 4, Item 413 (See Col 5, Lines 3-26).

The claimed limitation "one or more event managers, where each of said one or more event managers is configured to detect particular types of events" is Figure 3, item 310.

The claimed limitation "one or more action handlers, where each of said one or more action handlers is configured to initiate particular types of actions," is met by Figure 3, item 350.

The claimed limitation "...wherein each of said event broker, said clients, said event managers, and said action handlers comprise distinct functional entities" is met by Figure 3.

The claimed limitation "wherein a first event manager of said one or more event managers is configured to notify said event broker of a first event which corresponds to a first event booking, in response to detecting said first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 5, Lines 67-Col 6, Lines 19).

The claimed limitation "wherein the event broker is configured to notify a first action handler which corresponds to the first event booking, in response to receiving notification from the first event manager of the detected first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 8, Lines 1-13).

The claimed limitation, "wherein the first action handler is configured to initiate a first action, in response to receiving notification from the event broker of the detected first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 11, Lines 10-26).

The claimed limitation, "wherein a first request of the requests for an event booking identifies a first event which may occur in the future and a first action to be taken upon occurrence of said first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 6, Lines 20-35; Col 6, Lines 57-62).

Pohlmann fails to explicitly disclose "wherein the first request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers".

However, note the **Warwick** reference figures 1-3, discloses system and method for accessing information made available by a kernel mode driver teaches where a request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers (See: Col 7, Line 54-Col 8, Line 39; Col 2, Lines 49-65: Figure 5), so as to avoid the computer system from suffering the performance burden of having similar code all loaded in the kernel.

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Pohlmann with the teaching of Warwick so as to avoid the computer system from suffering the performance burden of having similar code all loaded in the kernel.

Pohlmann as modified by Warwick, further do not clearly disclose that the event manager is configured to determine whether the booking will be accepted and provide a positive acknowledgement to the broker in response to determining that the event booking is accepted.

However, the examiner gives **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is notoriously well known in the art to use the concept of providing positive acknowledgement in response to determining that the entering of a task is accepted so as to ensure that the process

performed by the system is performed **(as disclosed in Walker et al (6,085,169), see Abstract, fig.1+, col.3, lines 41-59 and col.5, line 20-col.6, line 1+).**

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify system of Pohlmann and Warwick with the concept of providing positive acknowledgement in response to determining that the entering of a task is accepted so as to ensure that the process performed by the system is performed.

As to claim 2, Pohlmann fails to explicitly disclose that the event manager is not configured to communicate directly with the first action handler.

However, it is submitted that it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the event manager not configured to communicate directly with the first action handler so as to have an intermediate step between the two modules such as a buffering device so as to alleviate any problems associated with real time communication.

Claims 4, 7, 9, 17-21 are met by that discussed for claim 1.

As to claim 5, Pohlmann further discloses where at least a portion of the events are associated with a broadcast signal (col.1, lines 11-32 and col.2, lines 13-47).

As to claim 12, Pohlmann further discloses where the event broker is configured to maintain ranks corresponding to the event bookings and, if a plurality of the events have been detected, to initiate the corresponding actions in an order determined by the ranks (col.13, Lines 12-22).

As to claim 13, Pohlmann discloses that the clients are configured to access event bookings which have been stored by the event broker, said access comprising a query, a modification, or a termination of a stored event booking (col 13, Lines 23-29).

As to claim 14, Pohlmann as modified by Warwick, do not clearly disclose that the booking has an expiration time.

However, the examiner gives **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is notoriously well known in the art to have an expiration time associated with a booking or a task so as to prevent system resources from being unnecessarily allocated (**see Walker et al (6,085,169), see Abstract, fig.1+, col.3, lines 41-59 and col.5, line 20-col.6, line 1+).**

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify combined system with an expiration time associated with a booking or a task so as to prevent system resources from being unnecessarily allocated.

4. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** in view of **Warwick et al. (6,598,169)** as applied to claim 1 above, and further view of **Chawla (US Pat No 6,108,695)**.

As to claim 3, Pohlmann as modified by Warwick, teach an event notification system implemented in a receiver for a broadcast system, but silent as to the use of a framework comprising a software layer between an application layer and a driver layer.

However, **Chawla** teaches the use of a software layer between the "application layer" or the media stream manager and the "driver layer" or the low-level software

(Figure 3; Col 4, Lines 6-12), which is preferred in order to increase system performance and user control.

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of references with a software layer between the "application layer" or the media stream manager and the "driver layer" or the low-level software to increase system performance and user control.

As to claim 6, Chawla further discloses a system for managing channels on a multiple channel digital media server. The reference fails to explicitly disclose the use of library extensions as claimed.

However, the examiner gives **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is notoriously well known in the art to use library extensions for addressing files (**see Broman et al (5,754,858), see Abstract, col.1, lines 23-35, col.2, line 30-col.3, line 1+ and col.4, line 64-col.5, line 1+).**

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Chawla with library extensions for addressing files.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** in view of **Warwick et al. (6,598,169)** and further view of **Chernock et al (2003/0159150).**

As to claim 8, Pohlmann as modified by Warwick further discloses an event notification system, but silent as to disclose a plurality of distinct event types and actions.

However, Chernock teaches the use of plurality of distinct event types and actions. Some of these event types and actions are: "Tuning the receiving device to play the subsequent program" "Recording a subsequent program or its selected embedded content at the scheduled time on an external video recording medium for video, on an external audio recording medium for audio, and on internal or external digital data recording medium for other digital data" "Reminding the user of the scheduled event at the scheduled time, with a video or audio notification, which will allow the user to tune the STB device to play the program" (Paragraphs 0018-0020), which provides a user more options

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Pohlmann as modified by Warwick to provide the users with more options

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** in view of **Warwick et al. (6,598,169)** as applied to claim 1 and 22 above, and further view of **Sudhakaran et al (6,636,901)**.

As to claim 11, Pohlmann as modified by Warwick, further discloses an event notification system, but silent as to where the event broker is configured to determine the recourses required and resolve resource conflicts.

However in the same field of endeavor, **Sudhakaran** teaches automatically determining the resources required and resolving any resource conflicts so that one or more resources can be shared between different functions in an error free fashion.

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Pohlmann et al. with automatically determining the resources required and resolving any resource conflicts so that one or more resources can be shared between different functions in an error free fashion.

7. Claims 22-25 and 28-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawler et al. (US Pat No 5,699,107)** in view of **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** further in view of **Warwick et al (6,598,169)**.

As to claim 22, **Lawler** discloses a program reminder system that reminds a user of an interactive viewing system when a pre-selected program is available (see fig.1+, col.2, lines 33-59, col.3, line 37-col.4, line 36, col.6, lines 25-61 and col.9, line 31-col.10, line 1+).

Lawler is silent with respect to **a first event manager, a first action handler, and an event broker mechanism**.

However, **Pohlmann** discloses "...a first event manager, a first action handler, and an event broker mechanism..."; "**an event broker** configured to register a plurality of event bookings in response to requests from one or more clients, where each the event booking identifies an event which may occur in the future and an action to be taken should the identified event occur" is met by Figure 4, Item 413 (See Col 5, Lines 3-26); the claimed limitation "...**event manager(s)**, where each of said one or more

event managers is configured to detect particular types of events" is Figure 3, item 310; the claimed limitation "...**action handler(s)**, where each of said one or more action handlers is configured to initiate particular types of actions," is met by Figure 3, item 350; the claimed limitation "...wherein each of said event broker, said clients, said event managers, and said action handlers comprise distinct functional entities" is met by Figure 3; the claimed limitation "wherein a first event manager of said one or more event managers is configured to notify said event broker of a first event which corresponds to a first event booking, in response to detecting said first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 5, Lines 67-Col 6, Lines 19); the claimed limitation "wherein the event broker is configured to notify a first action handler which corresponds to the first event booking, in response to receiving notification from the first event manager of the detected first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 8, Lines 1-13); the claimed limitation, "wherein the first action handler is configured to initiate a first action, in response to receiving notification from the event broker of the detected first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 11, Lines 10-26); and the claimed limitation, "wherein a first request of the requests for an event booking identifies a first event which may occur in the future and a first action to be taken upon occurrence of said first event" is met by Figure 3-4 (See Col 6, Lines 20-35; Col 6, Lines 57-62)...as recited, so as to an integrated system for providing tools that utilize a compatible interface without significantly sacrificing tool functionality.

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lawler with a first event manager, a first action handler, and an event broker mechanism for the stated advantage.

Lawler as modified by Pohlmann fail to explicitly disclose "wherein the first request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers."

However, **Warwick** teaches a "first request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers" (See: Col 7, Line 54 - Col 8, Line 39; Col 2, Lines 49-65: Figure 5) so as to avoid the computer system from suffering the performance burden of having similar code all loaded in the kernel.

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Lawler and Pohlmann with a "first request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers" for the stated advantage.

As to claim 23, Lawler et al. discloses an interactive television system receiver coupled to receive a broadcast signal and configured to provide an output signal to a television. "The demodulator 52 functions as a conventional television tuner for selecting one or more of multiple conventional analog video signals present at input 48" (Col 6, Lines 12-15). "The interactive station controller 18 also may include a

graphics subsystem 62 that is controlled by the CPU 58 to form graphics images, including user interface displays, on the video display 20" (Col 6, Lines 32-35).

Claims 24 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 22.

As to claim 25, the combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose that the event manager is not configured to communicate directly with the first action handler.

However, it is submitted that it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the event manager not configured to communicate directly with the first action handler so as to have an intermediate step between the two modules such as a buffering device so as to alleviate any problems associated with real time communication.

As to claim 28, the combination further discloses where the clients are configured to initiate accesses to event booking which have been stored by the event broker mechanism, the accesses comprising a query, a modification, or a termination of a stored event booking, and where the mechanism is configured to control the accesses to event bookings based on permissions associated with the accesses and the event bookings (Lawler col.2, lines 33-59, col.3, line 37-col.4, line 36, col.6, lines 25-61 and col.9, line 31-col.10, line 1+; Pohlmann further discloses this limitation as met in claims 1 and 13 above).

As to claim 29, the combination further discloses a non-volatile storage device, where the event broker mechanism is configured to store event bookings on the non-volatile storage device (Lawler: col.9, line 31-col.10, line 14).

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawler et al. (US Pat No 5,699,107)** in view of **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** further in view of **Warwick et al (6,598,169)** as applied to claim 22 above, and further view of **Sudhakaran et al (6,636,901)**.

As to claim 27, Lawler as modified by Pohlman and Warwick further discloses where the mechanism is configured to receive one or more request "...an additional request for an event booking, where the additional request indicates a second action...", register the additional event booking requests (see figs. 3-4, Col 5, Lines 67-Col 6, Lines 19 and col.7, line 51-col.8, line 45) and further discloses logic test filters and updating/sending events based on the results of the test, but silent as to where the event broker is configured to determine a resource conflict exists between the event booking request and the additional event booking request and resolve resource conflicts.

However in the same field of endeavor, **Sudhakaran** teaches automatically determining the resources required and resolving any resource conflicts based on requests received so that one or more resources can be shared between different functions in an error free fashion.

Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lawler as modified by Pohlmann and Warwick, with automatically determining the resources required and resolving any resource conflicts so that one or more resources can be shared between different functions in an error free fashion.

Response to Arguments

9. With respect to claims 1-2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12-15 and 17-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** in view of **Warwick et al. (6,598,169)**; Claims 22-25 and 28-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawler et al. (US Pat No 5,699,107)** in view of **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** further in view of **Warwick et al (6,598,169)** and the various 103(a) rejections, Applicant traverses the rejections, recites features of the claim limitations, cites a few portions in Pohlmann reference, discusses the office action and further argues that, "...some claims were not properly rejected..." that "...Pohlmann does not disclose such features..." that "...nowhere does Pohlmann disclose the event correlator is 'configured to register a plurality of event bookings in response to requests from one or more clients, wherein each said event booking identifies an event which may occur in the future and an action to be taken should the identified event occur.' Neither does the remaining cited art disclose such features." that "...Pohlmann does not disclose the event booking in the manner recited" and further argues that "...one would not be motivated to modify Pohlmann as suggested by the examiner." (see page 10/15+ of Applicant's Remarks).

In response, Examiner disagrees. As to Applicant's arguments that some claims were not properly rejected, Examiner has properly corrected the error(s) as discussed in the ground(s) of rejection above. Examiner further notes Appellant's arguments, however, **Pohlmann** discloses "An event broker..." (fig.4, Item 413) configured to register a plurality of event bookings in response to requests from one or more clients,

where each the event booking identifies an event which may occur in the future (“...events that have yet to occur...” col.5, line 36-39) and an action to be taken should the identified event occur (col. 5, lines 3-39); one or more event managers (fig.3, Item 310), where each of the one or more event managers is configured to detect particular types of events; Pohlmann further discloses one or more action handlers (fig.3, Item 350), where each of the one or more action handlers is configured to initiate particular types of actions; where each of the event broker, the clients, the event managers, and the action handlers comprise distinct functional entities; where a first event manager of the one or more event managers is configured to notify the event broker of a first event which corresponds to a first event booking, in response to detecting said first event (figs.3-4, col. 5, lines 67-col 6, lines 19); where the event broker is configured to notify a first action handler which corresponds to the first event booking, in response to receiving notification from the first event manager of the detected first event is (col. 8, lines 1-13); where the first action handler is configured to initiate a first action, in response to receiving notification from the event broker of the detected first event (col. 11, lines 10-26); where a first request of the requests for an event booking identifies a first event which may occur in the future and a first action to be taken upon occurrence of the first event (col 6, Lines 20-35; Col 6, Lines 57-62). Pohlmann teaches registering a plurality of event bookings in response to requests from the client and identifies events that have yet to occur (future events), but silent to where the first request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers. However,

this deficiency in Pohlmann is disclosed **Warwick**. Warwick discloses in figures 1-3, a system and method for accessing information made available by a kernel mode driver teaches where a request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers (col. 7, line 54-col.8, line 39; col 2, lines 49-65 and fig.5). Pohlmann as modified by Warwick, further do not clearly disclose that the event manager is configured to determine whether the booking will be accepted and provide a positive acknowledgement to the broker in response to determining that the event booking is accepted. However, the examiner gives **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is notoriously well known in the art to use the concept of providing positive acknowledgement in response to determining that the entering of a task is accepted so as to ensure that the process performed by the system is performed (**as disclosed in Walker et al (6,085,169), see Abstract, fig.1+, col.3, lines 41-59 and col.5, line 20-col.6, line 1+**). Hence, the 103(a) rejection is proper, meets all the claim limitations and maintained as discussed above.

As to the 103(a) rejection of claims 22-25 and 28-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawler et al. (US Pat No 5,699,107)** in view of **Pohlmann et al (6,446,136)** further in view of **Warwick et al (6,598,169)**. Lawler discloses a program reminder system that reminds a user of an interactive viewing system when a pre-selected program is available. Lawler is silent with respect to a first event manager, a first action handler, and an event broker mechanism. However, in the same field of endeavor, Pohlmann discloses a first event manager, a first action

handler, and an event broker mechanism as clearly discussed above. Lawler as modified by Pohlmann, fail to explicitly disclose where the first request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers. However, this deficiency is disclosed in Warwick, which teaches a first request includes a description of the first event using a syntax which is unintelligible to the event broker but which is intelligible to a first event manager of the event managers (col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 39; col. 2, lines 49-65 and figure 5). Hence, the 103(a) rejection is proper, meets all the claim limitations and maintained as discussed above.

As to Appellant's arguments that one would not be motivated to combine the references, Examiner maintains the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporate into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. In this case Pohlmann teaches an event management system for dynamic correlation of events. Warwick discloses event management system for managing networks, applications, databases and devices, as such combining the teaching of Warwick with Pohlmann and the other 103(a) rejection would be within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art and appropriate motivation was given. Hence, Examiner maintains the 103(a) rejection is proper, since the rejection meets all the claim limitations. For the same reasons discussed above, Examiner further maintains that the various 103(a) rejections are

proper, meets all the claims limitations. **Examiner has further provided references as to support all the official notice..., in the office action above. This office action is non-final.**

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Walker et al (7,613,631) discloses method and system for managing subscription.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **ANNAN Q. SHANG** whose telephone number is **(571)272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **7:00am-4:00pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)**. If you would like assistance from a **USPTO Customer Service Representative** or access to the automated information system, **call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000**.

/Annan Q Shang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2424

Annan Q. Shang